



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,373	12/09/2003	Chellappa Balan	132814-1/YOD GERD:0067	4420
41838 7590 06/26/2008 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (PCPI) C/O FLETCHER YODER P. O. BOX 692289 HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289			EXAMINER WALKER, KEITH D	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/26/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,373	Applicant(s) BALAN, CHELLAPPA	
	Examiner KEITH WALKER	Art Unit 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,13-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,13-17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

The arguments presented in the appeal brief of 4/14/08 against the prior art of Ukai, Take and Nakamura were convincing. Since all the claims were not rejected under the prior art of Farooque as presented in the Final Action of 11/14/07, the case is reopened for examination.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13-17 & 19 are pending examination as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 13, 15, 16 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,380,600 (Hansen).

Hansen teaches a co-production system comprising a molten carbonate fuel cell and a separation unit configured to receive anode exhaust steam. The recycled anode exhaust stream goes through a shift reactor, a condenser and a hydrogen recovery unit before being fed back to the anode inlet stream. Natural gas is used for the fuel and air for the oxidant (Fig. 1; Abstract; 2:55-3:40). A heat exchange plate is used to receive and heat the fuel feed stream (Figs. 2 & 3).

Regarding claims 2, 4 & 5, these limitations are directed to the method of operating the fuel cell and intended use of the fuel cell and therefore do not further limit the structure of the fuel cell. While intended use recitations and other types of functional language are not entirely disregarded, the intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function (MPEP 2114). The manner of operating the device does not differentiate an apparatus claim from the prior art. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim (MPEP 2114).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 3-10, 15, 17 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,084,362 (Farooque) in view of US 7,052,790 (Nakamura) and as evidenced by US Patent 3,522,101 (Baker).

With respect to claims 1, 9 & 10, Farooque teaches a fuel cell system for co-production of hydrogen and electricity comprising a molten carbonate fuel cell or solid oxide fuel cell assembly and an internal reforming apparatus that produces hydrogen fuel from hydrocarbon gas. The fuel cell system further comprises hydrogen separation and recovery device (8), which separates and recovers the unspent hydrogen in the anode exhaust, which comprises CO, CO₂, steam and unspent fuel (1:43-56, 2:1-10, 2:54-61). Unspent hydrogen in the anode exhaust is recycled back to the anode inlet (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 2, 4 & 5, these limitations are directed to the method of operating the fuel cell and intended use of the fuel cell and therefore do not further limit the structure of the fuel cell. While intended use recitations and other types of functional language are not entirely disregarded, the intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function (MPEP 2114). The manner of operating the device does not differentiate an apparatus claim from the prior art. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate

Art Unit: 1795

the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim (MPEP 2114).

With respect to claim 2, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to operate the fuel cell in a low utilization manner so as to increase the amount of hydrogen in the exhaust so the hydrogen can supply fuel to other components of the system like a burner or gasifier, as taught by Farooque.

With respect to claim 4, it is well known in the art that molten carbonate fuel cell are operated at voltages ranging from 0.55 to 0.8 volts as evidenced by Baker (US 3,522,101), Example 2.

Regarding claim 5, Farooque is silent to the mole fraction of hydrogen at the anode outlet. However, Farooque discloses the hydrogen content in the exhaust stream can be manipulated by converting any CO in the stream to hydrogen (2:53-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to control the mole fraction of hydrogen in the anode exhaust between 0.1 and 0.5, because Farooque discloses converting the carbon monoxide in the exhaust stream can modify the amounts of hydrogen in the anode exhaust.

With respect to claim 6, Farooque teaches the oxidant is air.

With respect to claim 7, Farooque teaches the use of methane as the fuel (2:22-29).

With respect to claim 8, Farooque teaches the heat provided by the hydrogen for the gasifier (5) (2:42-53).

With respect to claim 15, Farooque teaches the fuel cell system comprising a shift converter and a hydrogen separation and recovery device (2:54-61).

Farooque is silent to the system comprising a water condenser for the anode exhaust.

Nakamura teaches a fuel cell system comprising a cooling water, a cooling water pump, a heat exchanger, a fuel-side condenser and an oxidizer-side condenser that cool exhaust fuel gas and the exhaust oxidizer gas discharged from the fuel cell to condense content water vapor (Abstract; Fig. 1; 3:45-60, 6:15-20, 9:50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use add a condenser downstream of the fuel cell system of Farooque, because Nakamura teaches the use of the condenser to condense content water vapor in the exhaust.

Regarding claim 17, Farooque incorporates by reference the teachings of US 4,620,914 (Abens) (2:62-65). Abens teaches the hydrogen separation device includes a membrane (Abens - 1:20-25).

3. Claims 13, 14 & 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,084,362 (Farooque) and US 7,052,790 (Nakamura) as applied to claims 1 & 15 above, and further in view of US 2004/0202914 (Sridhar).

The teachings of Farooque and Nakamura as discussed above are incorporated herein.

Farooque and Nakamura are silent to the system comprising a carbon dioxide separator.

Sridhar discloses a fuel cell system comprising a carbon dioxide separator (405) to separate the carbon dioxide before the anode exhaust is discharged to the ambient. An adsorption /absorption based separator is used (Fig. 9, paragraph 93.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use add a carbon dioxide separator downstream of the fuel cell system of Farooque, because Sridhar teaches the use of the separator to separate the carbon dioxide before the anode exhaust is discharged to the ambient.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in response to the prior art of Farooque in the Appeal Brief of 4/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues hindsight reasoning and no motivation to combine the Farooque reference with Nakamura. Motivation for the combination has been provided in the rejection as discussed above and the motivation comes from the teachings of the references. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant argues “the recycling of hydrogen to a gasifier and recycling to a fuel cell (anode inlet) are not the same.” and therefore Farooque doesn't meet the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, “a recycle stream in which at least a portion of the anode exhaust stream is recycled back to the anode inlet after separation of hydrogen...” This limitation is met by the teachings of Farooque. The claims do not prevent the recycled anode exhaust from going through other components before going back to the anode inlet. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims.

Applicant argues the combination of Farooque and Nakamura would be “unnecessary”. Farooque teaches using steam recovered from the cathode side exhaust to run the turbo compressor (Fig. 1, 3:1-40). The steam from the turbo compressor is then combined with the hydrogen supply line for the fuel cell, same as applicant. As discussed above, Farooque is silent to recovering the water from the anode exhaust, but clearly teaches recovering steam and water from the fuel cell system to improve efficiency (1:40-55; 2:20-55). Nakamura teaches recovering water from either or both the anode exhaust and the cathode exhaust (3:45-60; 6:15-20; 9:50-55). So Nakamura teaches it is well known in the art to recover water from one or both exhaust lines. Furthermore, Nakamura teaches another method of collecting more water for the use in the fuel cell system by recovering water from both the anode and cathode exhausts.

Regarding applicant's argument that anode exhaust is added after the water is removed; the claims do not limit the addition of water to the anode stream, just removal of water. The arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEITH WALKER whose telephone number is (571)272-3458. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

K. Walker

/PATRICK RYAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795